arXiv:hep-th/0303117v3 18 May 2003

March 2003

Quantum deSitter cosmology and phantom matter

Shin'ichi NOJIRI[1] and Sergei D. ODINTSOV♠[2]

Department of Applied Physics
National Defence Academy, Hashirimizu Yokosuka 239-8686, JAPAN

♠ *Lab. for Fundamental Studies, Tomsk State Pedagogical University,*
634041 Tomsk, RUSSIA

ABSTRACT

We consider deSitter universe and Nariai universe induced by quantum CFT with classical phantom matter and perfect fluid. The model represents the combination of trace-anomaly driven inflation and phantom driven deSitter universe. The similarity of phantom matter with quantum CFT indicates that phantom scalar may be the effective description for some quantum field theory. It is demonstrated that it is easier to achieve the acceleration of the scale factor preserving the energy conditions in such unified model. Some properties of unified theory (anti-gravitating solutions, negative ADM mass Nariai solution, relation with steady state) are briefly mentioned.

PACS: 98.80.Hw,04.50.+h,11.10.Kk,11.10.Wx

---

[1] nojiri@cc.nda.ac.jp

[2] odintsov@mail.tomsknet.ru Also at ICREA and IEEC, Barcelona, Spain

1. Recent astrophysical data indicate to the acceleration of the scale factor of the observable universe [1]. There is number of scenarios (see [2] and refs. therein) where it is considered the dark energy, which generates the acceleration. One simple possibility to model such the accelerating scale factor is to introduce the (phantom) matter with negative energy density [3]. Such phantom matter may serve as another candidate for dark energy. However, due to number of problems (violation of energy conditions and related negative energy density) it does not seem to be quite realistic dark energy. In this respect, several questions appear. Can one suggest the natural mechanism of generation of phantom matter at the early Universe? Is it possible to construct the cosmological model where positive aspects of phantom still survive and negative aspects somehow disappear?

The strange properties of the phantom scalar (with negative kinetic energy) in the space with non-zero cosmological constant have been recently discussed in the very interesting paper by Gibbons [4]. In the present letter we consider some generalization of phantom cosmology, i.e. the situation where classical matter contains perfect fluid and phantom scalar but there is also quantum contribution. The quantum effects are described via the account of conformal anomaly, reminding about anomaly-driven inflation [5]. Quantum effects may lead also to negative energy density (for higher derivative conformal matter) or to negative pressure (usual matter) what may indicate that phantom corresponds to the effective description of some QFT. Then, it suggests some mechanism to introduce the phantom at early Universe. On the same time, it is easier to get the consistent deSitter-like universe (even with zero cosmological constant) due to unified theory: phantom and QFT. This is again quite interesting: acceleration of the scale factor is achieved due to phantom, but most of energy conditions are satisfied due to quantum effects! We also describe the consistent Nariai universe induced by such unified model. Again, like in pure phantom cosmology, it is shown that quantum effects may generate the negative ADM mass solution.

2. Let us start from the Einstein equation with the phantom (scalar) field C [4]

$$R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}Rg_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi G\left\{\left(\rho+p\right)U_\mu U_\nu + pg_{\mu\nu} - \partial_\mu C\partial_\nu C + \frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu}g^{\alpha\beta}\partial_\alpha C\partial_\beta C\right\}\ . \tag{1}$$

Let the metric of the 4 dimensional spacetime has the warped form:

$$ds^2 = -dt^2 + L^2 \mathrm{e}^{2A} \sum_{i,j=1}^{3} \tilde{g}_{ij} dx^i dx^j \ . \tag{2}$$

Here $\tilde{g}_{ij}$ is the metric which satisfies $\tilde{R}_{ij} = k\tilde{g}_{ij}$ with the Ricci curvature $\tilde{R}_{ij}$ given by $\tilde{g}_{ij}$ and $k = 0, \pm 2$. The simplest way to account for quantum effects (at least, for conformal matter) is to include the contributions from the conformal anomaly:

$$T = b\left(F + \frac{2}{3}\Box R\right) + b'G + b''\Box R \ , \tag{3}$$

where F is the square of 4d Weyl tensor, G is Gauss-Bonnet invariant, which are given as

$$\begin{aligned} F &= \frac{1}{3}R^2 - 2R_{ij}R^{ij} + R_{ijkl}R^{ijkl} \\ G &= R^2 - 4R_{ij}R^{ij} + R_{ijkl}R^{ijkl} \ , \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

In general, with N scalar, $N_{1/2}$ spinor, N_1 vector fields, N_2 ($= 0$ or 1) gravitons and N_{HD} higher derivative conformal scalars, b, b' and b'' are given by

$$\begin{aligned} b &= \frac{N + 6N_{1/2} + 12N_1 + 611N_2 - 8N_{\mathrm{HD}}}{120(4\pi)^2} \\ b' &= -\frac{N + 11N_{1/2} + 62N_1 + 1411N_2 - 28N_{\mathrm{HD}}}{360(4\pi)^2} \ , \quad b'' = 0 \ . \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

The contributions due to conformal anomaly to ρ and p are found in [6, 7],

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_A &= -\frac{1}{a^4}\Big[b'\left(6a^4H^4 + 12a^2H^2\right) \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{2}{3}b + b''\right)\left\{a^4\left(-6HH_{,tt} - 18H^2H_{,t} + 3H_{,t}^2\right) + 6a^2H^2\right\} \\ &\quad -2b + 6b' - 3b''\Big], \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

$$\begin{aligned} p_A &= b'\left\{6H^4 + 8H^2H_{,t} + \frac{1}{a^2}\left(4H^2 + 8H_{,t}\right)\right\} \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{2}{3}b + b''\right)\Big\{ -2H_{,ttt} - 12HH_{,tt} - 18H^2H_{,t} - 9H_{,t}^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{a^2}\left(2H^2 + 4H_{,t}\right)\Big\} - \frac{-2b + 6b' - 3b''}{3a^4} \ . \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Here, the “radius” of the universe a and the Hubble parameter H are

$$a \equiv L\mathrm{e}^{A} \ , \quad H = \frac{1}{a}\frac{da}{dt} = \frac{dA}{dt} \ . \tag{8}$$

One may also set

$$U_\mu = \delta^t{}_\mu \ , \quad C = \tilde a t + \tilde b \ . \tag{9}$$

The latter is the solution of the equation of motion of the phantom field:

$$0 = \Box C = -\partial_t^2 C \ . \tag{10}$$

Note that $\tilde a$ and $\tilde b$ are arbitrary then there are infinitely many solutions (distributions of phantom matter) of (10). In order to simplify the discussion, the deSitter space is taken below in the following form (instead of (2):

$$ds^2 = -dt^2 + L^2 \cosh^2 \frac{t}{L} d\Omega_3^2 \ . \tag{11}$$

Then , calculating quantum energy density and pressure one gets

$$\rho_A = -p_A = -\frac{6b'}{L^4} \ . \tag{12}$$

Since for the metric (11),

$$R_{\mu\nu} = \frac{3}{L^2} g_{\mu\nu} \ , \quad R = \frac{12}{L^2} \ , \tag{13}$$

the (tt) and (ij)-components in the Einstein equations (1) with account of quantum effects are, respectively:

$$\frac{3}{L^2} = 8\pi G \left(\rho_{\mathrm{matter}} - \frac{6b'}{L^4} - \frac{\tilde a^2}{2} \right) \ , \tag{14}$$

$$-\frac{3}{L^2} = 8\pi G \left(p_{\mathrm{matter}} + \frac{6b'}{L^4} - \frac{\tilde a^2}{2} \right) \ . \tag{15}$$

Here ρ_{matter} and p_{matter} are contributions from the matter to the energy density ρ and pressure p. One sees that for higher-derivative scalar, like for classical phantom, the quantum energy density is negative. On the same time, for usual matter the quantum energy is positive, while quantum pressure is negative. Hence, in principle, phantom field may be some effective theory coming from more fundamental QFT. In other words, qualitatively we suggested the way how phantom may appear at the early Universe.

By combining (14) and (15), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \rho_{\mathrm{matter}} + p_{\mathrm{matter}} - \tilde{a}^2 \ , & (16) \\ 0 &= \frac{12b'}{L^4} + \frac{6}{8\pi G L^2} - \rho_{\mathrm{matter}} + p_{\mathrm{matter}} \ , & (17) \end{aligned}$$

which tells that there is a dS solution even if there is no cosmological constant. Eq.(17) has solutions

$$\frac{1}{L^2} = \frac{1}{12b'} \left\{ -\frac{3}{4\pi G} \pm \sqrt{\left(\frac{3}{8\pi G}\right)^2 + 12b' \left(\rho_{\mathrm{matter}} - p_{\mathrm{matter}}\right)} \right\} \ , \qquad (18)$$

with respect to L^2 if

$$\left(\frac{3}{8\pi G}\right)^2 + 12b' \left(\rho_{\mathrm{matter}} - p_{\mathrm{matter}}\right) \geq 0 \ . \qquad (19)$$

We should note the $+$-sign in $\pm$ in (18) corresponds to the solution of ref.[4] in the limit $b' \to 0$. On the other hand, when $\rho_{\mathrm{matter}} - p_{\mathrm{matter}} = 0$, the solution with $-$-sign in $\pm$ in (18) corresponds to the anomaly driven inflation by Starobinsky[5]. The limiting case $\rho_{\mathrm{matter}} = p_{\mathrm{matter}}$ describes the stiff matter. Without quantum effects, there is no non-trivial solution for L^2 [4] but due to the conformal anomaly, there is a nontrivial solution even for the stiff matter. Having now the explicit deSitter cosmological solution, one can address the question: how the energy conditions look in our model?

There are several standard types of the energy conditions in cosmology:

- Null Energy Condition (NEC):

$$\rho + p \geq 0 \qquad (20)$$

- Weak Energy Condition (WEC):

$$\rho \geq 0 \text{ and } \rho + p \geq 0 \qquad (21)$$

- Strong Energy Condition (SEC):

$$\rho + 3p \geq 0 \text{ and } \rho + p \geq 0 \qquad (22)$$

- Dominant Energy Condition (DEC):

$$\rho \geq 0 \text{ and } \rho \pm p \geq 0 \tag{23}$$

For the present case, from Eqs.(14) and (15), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\text{matter}} &= \frac{6b'}{L^4} + \frac{\tilde{a}^2}{2} + \frac{3}{8\pi G L^2}, & (24) \\ p_{\text{matter}} &= -\frac{6b'}{L^4} + \frac{\tilde{a}^2}{2} - \frac{3}{8\pi G L^2} \ . & (25) \end{aligned}$$

NEC is always satisfied from (16):

$$\rho_{\text{matter}} + p_{\text{matter}} \geq 0 \ . \tag{26}$$

WEC could be satisfied, from (24), if

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{6b'}{L^4} + \frac{\tilde{a}^2}{2} + \frac{3}{8\pi G L^2} \\ = \ & \frac{\tilde{a}^2}{2L^4} \left\{ L^2 - \frac{1}{\tilde{a}^2} \left(-\frac{3}{8\pi G} + \sqrt{\left(\frac{3}{8\pi G}\right)^2 - 12b'} \right) \right\} \\ & \times \left\{ L^2 - \frac{1}{\tilde{a}^2} \left(-\frac{3}{8\pi G} - \sqrt{\left(\frac{3}{8\pi G}\right)^2 - 12b'} \right) \right\} \\ \geq \ & 0 \ . \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

If $b' < 0$ as usually, the quantity inside the square root is always positive. Eq.(27) gives a non-trivial constraint for the length parameter L^2

$$L^2 \geq \frac{1}{\tilde{a}^2} \left(-\frac{3}{8\pi G} + \sqrt{\left(\frac{3}{8\pi G}\right)^2 - 12b'} \right) \ . \tag{28}$$

In case of no quantum effects ($b' = 0$), the constraint becomes trivial: $L^2 \geq 0$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\text{matter}} + 3p_{\text{matter}} &= -\frac{12b'}{L^4} + 2\tilde{a}^2 - \frac{3}{4\pi G L^2} \\ &= \frac{2\tilde{a}^2}{2L^4} \left\{ L^2 - \frac{1}{\tilde{a}^2} \left(\frac{3}{16\pi G} + \sqrt{\left(\frac{3}{16\pi G}\right)^2 + 6b'} \right) \right\} \\ & \quad \times \left\{ L^2 - \frac{1}{\tilde{a}^2} \left(\frac{3}{16\pi G} - \sqrt{\left(\frac{3}{16\pi G}\right)^2 + 6b'} \right) \right\} \ , \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

if

$$\left(\frac{3}{16\pi G}\right)^2 + 6b' \leq 0 \ , \tag{30}$$

the quantity inside the square root in (29) is non-positive and we find the SEC is always satisfied; $\rho_{\rm matter} + 3p_{\rm matter} \geq 0$. On the other hand, if

$$\left(\frac{3}{16\pi G}\right)^2 + 6b' > 0 \ , \tag{31}$$

the SEC gives the non-trivial constraint for L^2

$$\begin{aligned} & 0 \leq L^2 \leq \frac{1}{\tilde a^2}\left(\frac{3}{16\pi G} - \sqrt{\left(\frac{3}{16\pi G}\right)^2 + 6b'}\right) \\ \text{or} \qquad & L^2 \geq \frac{1}{\tilde a^2}\left(\frac{3}{16\pi G} + \sqrt{\left(\frac{3}{16\pi G}\right)^2 + 6b'}\right) \ . \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

The above contraint becomes trivial ($L^2 \geq 0$) again if we do not include the conformal anomaly. Since b' is negative for the usual matter fields, Eq.(30) tells that if the quantum effect is large, the SEC could be satisfied more easily. On the other hand if the quantum effect is small but does not vanish, the SEC may not be satisfied.

Eq.(19) can be rewritten, if $b' < 0$, as

$$\rho_{\rm matter} - p_{\rm matter} \leq -\frac{1}{12b'}\left(\frac{3}{8\pi G}\right)^2 \ , \tag{33}$$

which does not conflict with the DEC but (33) gives non-trivial constraint for the matter field. This constraint does not appear if we do not include the contribution from the conformal anomaly. Then due to the quantum effect, there might happen that the DEC could not be satisfied.

The contributions to ρ and p from the phantom field C is, from (14) and (15), given by

$$\rho_C = p_C = -\frac{\tilde a^2}{2} \ . \tag{34}$$

Therefore any energy conditions cannot be satisfied for pure phantom unless $\tilde a = 0$. When $\tilde a = 0$, from (16) it follows

$$0 = \rho_{\rm matter} + p_{\rm matter} \ , \tag{35}$$

which is limiting case but does not violate any energy condition although this would require negative pressure. Thus, the energy conditions when quantum CFT presents are satisfied, unlike to the case of pure phantom.

The condition that the universe accelerates is that L^2 (18) is real. Therefore the condition is given by (19), which can be rewritten as (33) if $b' < 0$ as usual. If $b' > 0$, instead of (33), one gets

$$\rho_{\rm matter} - p_{\rm matter} \geq -\frac{1}{12b'}\left(\frac{3}{8\pi G}\right)^2 \ . \tag{36}$$

We may rewrite (tt) component of Eq.(1) in the form of the FRW equation:

$$H^2 = \frac{8\pi G}{3}\rho - \frac{k}{2a^2} \ . \tag{37}$$

Here the energy density ρ is a sum of the contributions from the matter, phantom field, and the conformal anomaly. The energy density ρ_C (34) from the phantom field is always constant. On the other hand, the energy density ρ_A (6) from the conformal anomaly contains the higher power of the Hubble parameter H and its higher derivatives. Although ρ_A is a constant in case of deSitter space, if the universe expands very rapidly, ρ_A mainly contributes to the expansion.

Eq.(1) tells that the total energy momentum tensor (EMT) $T_{\mu\nu} = T_{{\rm matter}\,\mu\nu} + T_{C\,\mu\nu} + T_{A\,\mu\nu}$ is conserved $\nabla^\mu T_{\mu\nu} = 0$ due to the Bianchi identiy. As in [4], each term of the EMT is not conserved. In [4], if the EMT $T_{C\,\mu\nu}$ coming from the phantom field C varies non-trivially, the steady state observer will observe the creation of the matter. The EMT $T_{A\,\mu\nu}$ defined by the conformal anomaly has been constructed in (6) to be conserved. Then the particle creation can occur if the phantom field becomes non-trivial. Since the energy density ρ_C in (34) from the phantom field, Eq.(24) tells that the matter energy density $\rho_{\rm matter}$ is also constant although the universe is expanding. This implies the steady creation of the matter. Taking into account the similarity of phantom with quantum matter, it may not look so strange. It is known that quantum particles creation occurs in the early universe.

In [4], the arguments are given that the phantom field C generates repulsive gravitational force (anti-gravity) and there appears multi-objects static solution as

$$ds^2 = -{\rm e}^{U(\mathbf{x})}dt^2 + {\rm e}^{-2U(\mathbf{x})}d\mathbf{x}^2 \ ,$$

$$\kappa\left(C - C_\infty\right) = U = -\sum_i \frac{M_i}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_i|} \ . \tag{38}$$

Here $\kappa^2 = 4\pi G$ and M_i's are constants, which can be negative or positive. Even with quantum effects, such a solution could exist when we can regard that the quantum effects are small. In an exotic case that $b' > 0$, the energy density (12) coming from the quantum effect becomes negative although the pressure is positive. Then the quantum effect itself may become a source of the anti-gravity. As discussed in [4], such a negative mass particle corresponding to the negative ADM mass solution chases the positive mass object. Then one may find such a exotic particle arround the black hole. Such a negative mass solution can be found exactly without the quantum correction. If the quantum correction is small and can be treated perturbatively, the qualitative structure would not be changed and such a solution could exist even if we include the quantum correction.

3. Another interesting example is the Nariai space, which is the extreme limit of the Schwarzschil-deSitter black hole, whose metric is given by the sum of 2d deSitter (dS_2) and 2d sphere S^2:

$$ds^2 = L^2\left(ds^2_{\mathrm{dS}_2} + d^2_{\mathrm{S}^2}\right) \ . \tag{39}$$

Then

$$F = \frac{16}{3L^4} \ , \quad G = \frac{8}{L^4} \ , \tag{40}$$

and therefore the conformal anomaly is given by

$$T = \frac{1}{L^4}\left(\frac{4}{3}b + 2b'\right) \ . \tag{41}$$

Approximately, the quantum EMT caused by the conformal anomaly (forgetting about vacuum dependent piece) is given by

$$T^A_{\mu\nu} = \frac{T}{4}g_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{L^4}\left(\frac{b}{3} + \frac{b'}{2}\right)g_{\mu\nu} \ . \tag{42}$$

When we choose the metric of 2d deSitter as

$$L^2 ds^2_{\mathrm{dS}_2} = -dt^2 + \mathrm{e}^{\frac{2t}{L}}dx^2 \ , \tag{43}$$

we may assume (9) again. Then the (tt) and (ij) components of (1) are given by

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{1}{L^2} &= 8\pi G \left\{ -\rho_{\mathrm{matter}} + \frac{\tilde{a}^2}{2} + \frac{1}{L^4}\left(\frac{b}{3} + \frac{b'}{2}\right)\right\} \ , \\ -\frac{1}{L^2} &= 8\pi G \left\{ p_{\mathrm{matter}} - \frac{\tilde{a}^2}{2} + \frac{1}{L^4}\left(\frac{b}{3} + \frac{b'}{2}\right)\right\} \ . \end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

If we analytically continue L^2 by $-L^2$, the spacetime metric (39) is replaced by the sum of 2d anti-deSitter space and 2d hyperboloid:

$$ds^2 = L^2 \left(ds^2_{\mathrm{AdS}_2} + d^2_{\mathrm{H}^2} \right) \ , \tag{45}$$

which can be obtained from Schwarzschild-AdS black hole with negative ADM mass by the Nariai-like limit. With the metric of 2d anti-deSitter as

$$L^2 ds^2_{\mathrm{AdS}_2} = dx^2 - \mathrm{e}^{\frac{2x}{L}} dt^2 \ , \tag{46}$$

Eq.(9) is a solution again. Then instead of (44) one gets

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{L^2} &= 8\pi G \left\{ -\rho_{\mathrm{matter}} + \frac{\tilde{a}^2}{2} + \frac{1}{L^4}\left(\frac{b}{3} + \frac{b'}{2}\right)\right\} \ , \\ \frac{1}{L^2} &= 8\pi G \left\{ p_{\mathrm{matter}} - \frac{\tilde{a}^2}{2} + \frac{1}{L^4}\left(\frac{b}{3} + \frac{b'}{2}\right)\right\} \ . \end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

As in (16) and (17), (47) may be written as

$$0 = \rho_{\mathrm{matter}} + p_{\mathrm{matter}} - \tilde{a}^2 \ , \tag{48}$$

$$\frac{2}{L^2} = 8\pi G \left\{ -\rho_{\mathrm{matter}} + p_{\mathrm{matter}} + \frac{2}{L^4}\left(\frac{b}{3} + \frac{b'}{2}\right)\right\} \ . \tag{49}$$

We should note that when $b' > -\frac{2}{3}b$, which is a little bit exotic, even if $\rho_{\mathrm{matter}} = p_{\mathrm{matter}} = \tilde{a} = 0$, there is a nontrivial solution of (49):

$$L^2 = -8\pi G \left(\frac{b}{3} + \frac{b'}{2}\right) \ , \tag{50}$$

which indicates that the quantum effects could generate the negative ADM mass solution. It follows that the unified model (with perfect fluid, phantom and quantum CFT) gives the possibility of the creation of Nariai universe.

Thus, we demonstrated that phantom scalar in many respects looks like strange effective quantum field theory. Moreover, when matter is composed of phantom, perfect fluid and quantum CFT it is somehow easier to realize the accelarating deSitter-like universe, while most of energy conditions may be preserved. It would be interesting to estimate the cosmological applications of phantom field non-minimally coupled with gravity.

Acknowledgments

The work by S.N. is supported in part by the Ministry of Education, Science, Sports and Culture of Japan under the grant n. 13135208.

References

[1] S. Perlmutter *et al.*, *Astrophys.J.* **517** (1999) 565;
A. Riess *et al.*, *Astron.J.* **116** (1998), 1009.

[2] M. Ozer and O. Taha, *Nucl.Phys.* **B287** (1987) 776;
K. Freese, F.C. Adams, J.A. Frieman and E. Mottola, *Nucl.Phys.* **B287** (1987), 797;
F.M. Overduin and F.I. Cooperstock, *Phys.Rev.* **D58** (1998), 043506;
J.V. Cunha, J.A.S. Lima and J. S. Alcaniz, *Phys.Rev.* **D66** (2002), 023520;
B. Ratra and P.J.E. Peebles, *Phys.Rev.* **D37** (1988) 3406;
J.A. Frieman, C.T. Hill, A. Stebbins and I. Waga, *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **75** (1995) 2077;
R.R. Caldwell, R. Dave and P. J. Steinhardt, *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **80** (1998) 1582;
M.S. Turner and M. White, *Phys.Rev.* **D56** (1997) R4439;
T. Chiba, N. Sugiyama and T. Nakamura, *Mon.Not.Roy.Astron.Soc.* **289** (1997), L5;
J. Kujat, A.M. Linn, R.J. Scherrer and D.H. Weinberg, *Astrophys.J.* **572** (2002) 1;
D. Jain, A. Dev, N. Panchapakesan, S. Mahajan and V. B. Bhatia, astro-ph/0105551;
M.C. Bento, O Bertolami and A.A. Sen, *Phys.Rev.* **D66** (2002), 043507;
J.S. Alcaniz, D. Jain and A. Dev, *Phys.Rev.* **D67** (2003) 043514, astro-

ph/0210476;
D. Carturan and F. Finelli, astro-ph/0211626;
B. Sandvik, M. Tegmark, M. Zaldarriaga and I. Waga, astro-ph/0212114;
G. Dvali, G. Gabadadze and M. Porrati, *Phys. Lett.* **B485** (2000) 208;
C. Deffayet, *Phys.Lett.* **B502** (2001) 199;
J.A.S. Lima and J.S. Alcaniz, *Astron.Astrophys.* **348**, 1 (1999);
P. Chimento, A.S. Jakubi and N.A. Zuccala, *Phys.Rev.* **D63** (2001), 103508;
W. Zimdahl, D.J. Schwarz, A.B. Balakin and D. Pavón, *Phys.Rev.* **D64** (2001) 063501;
K. Freese and M. Lewis, *Phys.Lett.* **B540** (2002), 1;
Z. Zhu and M. Fujimoto, *Astron.Astrophys.* **581**, 1 (2002);
G. Efstathiou, *Mon.Not.Roy.Astron.Soc.* **310**, 842 (1999).

[3] R.R. Caldwell, *Phys.Lett.* **B545** (2002) 23, astro-ph/9908168;
S. Hannestad, E. Mortsell, *Phys.Rev.* **D66** (2002) 063508, astro-ph/0205096;
B. Boisseau, G. Esposito-Farese, D. Polarski, A.A. Starobinsky, *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **85** (2000) 2236, gr-qc/0001066;
V. Faraoni, *Int.J.Mod.Phys.* **D11** (2002) 471, astro-ph/0110067;
V.K. Onemli, R.P. Woodard, *Class.Quant.Grav.* **19** (2002) 4607, gr-qc/0204065;
I. Maor, R. Brustein, J. McMahon, P.J. Steinhardt, *Phys.Rev.* **D65** (2002) 123003, astro-ph/0112526. S. M. Carroll, M. Hoffman and M. Trodden, astro-ph/0301273.

[4] G. Gibbons, hep-th/0302199.

[5] A. Starobinsky, *Phys.Lett.* **B91** (1980) 99.

[6] S. Nojiri and S.D. Odintsov, *Int.J.Mod.Phys.* **A16** (2001) 3273, hep-th/0011115.

[7] S. Nojiri, S.D. Odintsov and S. Ogushi, *Int.J.Mod.Phys.* **A17** (2002) 4809, hep-th/0205187.